

REMARKS

Applicant requests reconsideration of the application in view of the amendments and arguments addressing the new grounds of rejection.

Summary of Office Action

Claims 1-23 are pending.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 13, 15, and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,219,417 of Zhou ("Zhou") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,926,544 (Zhou II) which was incorporated by reference into U.S. Patent No. 6,219,417.

Claims 3 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Zhou in view of Zhou II.

Claims 5 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Zhou in view of Zhou II and U.S. Patent No. 5,528,682 of Cotreay ("Cotreay").

Claims 7, 10, 11 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Zhou in view of Zhou II and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,274,702 of Rosch, et al. ("Rosch").

Claims 8, 9, 12, 19, 20, and 23 were indicated as being allowable if re-written.

Summary of Amendments

Claims 1, 4, 10, and 13 were amended. Claim 10 was amended to correct antecedent basis. Support for the amendments to claims 1, 4, and 13 may be found at p. 11, lines 3-5, and p. 11, line 9 thru p. 12, line 7 of the specification and Figure 3 of the application as originally filed. Applicant submits that the amendments to the claims do not add new matter.

Reference to Applicant-Initiated Examiner Interview

A conference was initiated by the undersigned and conducted with the Examiner on March 9, 2006 based on the rejections set forth in the January 26, 2006 Final Office Action. The undersigned understood that the Examiner did not believe the introduction of the term “analog” rendered the independent claims patentable. The undersigned understood that the Examiner believed the claims needed language relating to “processing” the sensed signals in order to better identify the functions performed by the claimed method and apparatus so that they are distinguishable over prior art subscriber line interface circuits.

Accordingly, the “analog” limitation of the independent claims was removed by the present Amendment. Although the applicant does not agree with the Examiner’s arguments or interpretation of the cited references with respect to certain rejections, the undersigned has amended each independent claim (1, 4, and 13) to incorporate “processing” language that the undersigned believes is consistent with the telephonic discussions. The undersigned believes that this renders the disagreements moot and sincerely hopes the Examiner will now find the claims allowable.

Response to 35 U.S.C. § 102 rejections

Claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 13, and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by Zhou “in view of” Zhou II. Claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 13, 15, and 17 were rejected as being anticipated by Zhou “in view of” Zhou II. Given that the Examiner is treating Zhou as containing the contents of Zhou II for the purposes of a 35 U.S.C. § 102 rejection, applicant submits that the arguments made by applicant with respect to Zhou should be interpreted as being made with respect to Zhou and Zhou II unless noted otherwise. For readability, applicant will reference Zhou II only as necessary for specific citations.

As indicated above, claims 1, 4, and 13 have been amended consistent with the telephonic Examiner Interview described above. Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 13, and 17 as amended are not anticipated by Zhou.

In particular, applicant submits that Zhou does not disclose an integrated circuit having sense inputs for a sensed tip signal and a sensed ring signal of a subscriber loop, wherein the integrated circuit processes the sensed signals to generate a control signal for a subscriber loop linefeed driver, wherein the linefeed driver does not reside within a same integrated circuit.

In contrast, claim 1 includes the language:

1. An integrated circuit package comprising:
an integrated circuit having sense inputs for a sensed tip signal and a sensed ring signal of a subscriber loop, wherein the integrated circuit processes the sensed signals to generate a control signal for a subscriber loop linefeed driver, wherein the linefeed driver does not reside within a same integrated circuit.

(Claim 1, as amended)(*emphasis added*)

Claims 4 and 13 similarly include the language:

4. A subscriber loop linefeed driver comprising:
sense circuitry providing a sensed tip signal and a sensed ring signal to an integrated circuit, wherein the sensed tip and ring signals correspond to a tip current and a ring current of the subscriber loop; and
power circuitry for providing battery feed to a ring node and a tip node of the subscriber loop in accordance with a control signal, the integrated circuit processing the sensed tip and ring signal to generate the control signal, wherein the power circuitry does not reside within the integrated circuit.

(Claim 4, as amended)(*emphasis added*)

13. An apparatus comprising:
an integrated circuit processing a sensed tip signal and a sensed ring signal of a subscriber loop to generate subscriber loop control signals, the sensed tip and ring signals received by the integrated circuit; and
a linefeed driver for driving a subscriber loop in accordance with the subscriber loop control signals, the linefeed driver providing the sensed tip and ring signals.

(Claim 13, as amended)(*emphasis added*)

Applicant thus submits claims 1, 4, and 13 as amended are not anticipated by any of the cited references. Given that claims 2-3 depend from claim 1, claims 5-12 depend from claim 4, and claims 14-23 depend from claim 13, applicant submits claims 2-3, 5-12, and 14-23 are likewise not anticipated by the cited references.

Applicant respectfully submits that the 35 U.S.C. § 102 rejections have been overcome.

Response to 35 U.S.C. § 103 rejections of claims 3, 5, 7, 10, 11, 14, 16 and 18

With respect to these rejections, applicant maintains that none of the cited references, alone or in combination, teaches or suggests *an integrated circuit having sense inputs for a sensed tip signal and a sensed ring signal of a subscriber loop, wherein the integrated circuit processes the sensed signals to generate a control signal for a subscriber loop linefeed driver, wherein the linefeed driver does not reside within a same integrated circuit* as argued above with respect to the 35 U.S.C. § 102 rejections.

Applicant submits that the 35 U.S.C. § 103 rejections have only been presented with respect to dependent claims. If independent claims 1, 4, and 13 are nonobvious in view of the cited references, then claims 2-3, 5-12, and 14-23 (i.e., including the rejected claims) are likewise nonobvious in view of the cited references.

Applicant respectfully submits that the rejections of claims 3, 5, 7, 10, 11, 14, 16 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 have been overcome.

Conclusion

In view of the amendments and arguments presented above, applicant respectfully submits the applicable rejections and objections have been overcome. Accordingly, claims 1-23 as amended should be found to be in condition for allowance.

If there are any issues that can be resolved by telephone conference, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at (512) 858-9910.

Respectfully submitted,

Date June 26, 2006

William D. Davis
William D. Davis
Reg No. 38,428